UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,770	01/12/2004	Michael Gauselmann	ATR-A-127	1292

32566 7590 06/06/2008

PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
2635 NORTH FIRST STREET
SUITE 223
SAN JOSE, CA 95134

EXAMINER	
DEODHAR, OMKAR A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/755,770	GAUSELMANN, MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OMKAR A. DEODHAR	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 & 3-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Non-Final Rejection

Response to Amendment & Remarks

This Office action is responsive to amendment & arguments submitted with RCE on 4/25/2008.

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16-18 & 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys et al. (US 6,720,745).

Claims 1 & 7:

Applicant admits in the background of the invention that multicolored top lights are old & well known to the art and that they are used for signaling.

Applicant's Drawings, Figure 1, illustrate a "typical slot machine with a cylindrical top light".

Since Applicant is familiar with this typical slot machine and top light structure, it is used as the base reference for the section 103 rejections.

Applicant admitted prior art is silent regarding the following:

a programmable top light on a top of the housing for conveying information about the gaming device, the top light comprising a plurality of segments, each segment comprising a combination of red, green, and blue light emitting diodes (LEDs);

a programmable controller electrically connected to each of the red, green, and blue LEDs in each segment, the controller comprising variable current sources connected to supply a controllable current to each of the red, green, and blue LEDs in each segment to control intensities of light emitted by each of the red, green, and blue LEDs in each segment; and

the controller also comprising a programmable control portion that is programmable for controlling the variable current sources to supply selected currents to the red, green, and blue LEDs in each segment to cause any of a variety of colors to be emitted from each segment for conveying information about the gaming device: such that the programmable top light may be used in any of a variety of jurisdictions that have different specifications for the color of light emitted by each segment of a top light,

the controller being programmed to cause each of the segments to emit one or more selected colors from the variety of colors that can be emitted from each segment.

Lys discloses systems for a computer controlled multicolored lighting network. A current control for an LED lighting assembly is taught. See Col. 5. Lines 39-67 & Col. 6. Lines 1-67.

Lys teaches that is well known that three primary colors, RGB, can be combined in different proportions to generate almost any color in the visible light spectrum, See Col. 1. Lines 64-67 & Col. 2. Lines 1-7.

Lys teaches numerous applications for digitally controlled LED based light systems. Included are LED modules associated with entertainment devices, See figure 85 and the related description. A LED traffic light system is disclosed; this teaches a segment comprising a combination of LED lights, See Figure 47 and the related description. Figures 29-68 & the related descriptions teach and suggest a variety of applications. From Lys's disclosure, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the applicability of LED lighting systems used on gaming machines in a casino. In fact, the applicability of Lys's system is virtually limitless - any systems that use lights or requires illuminations could utilize Lys's system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Applicant admitted prior art in view Lys's current controlled LED lighting technology. As pointed out above, virtually any system using lights or requiring illumination could utilize LED's. This is considered a substitution of known elements with predictable results. The predictable results of using LED's as

opposed to conventional lighting systems are that LED's have increased efficiency, they give off virtually no heat and they have a longer lifetime, (See Lys, Col. 1. Lines 43-47).

Claims 3, 4 & 8:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys, as applied to the claims above teaches a segment comprising several LED lights. One such example is the LED traffic light shown in Figure 47.

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys does not teach two, or three, segments residing on the top of the gaming machine, or alternatively, residing side-by-side.

However, it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of Applicant's invention to vary the specific number of segments residing on the top of the gaming machine and their orientation. The basic concept of modifying a slot machine's top light with LED's is taught.

Claim 5:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys teaches a module containing RGB LED chips. See Col. 6. Lines 28-45.

Claim 6:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys teaches flashing LED's. See Col. 17. Lines 1-5.

Claim 9:

Applicant admitted prior art teaches a slot machine with a display.

Claims 11-14, 17-23:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys teaches digitally controlling the current in LED lighting assemblies, (See Col. 5. Lines 54-57). A computer (which has a processor & memory and uses software/firmware) controlled multicolored LED lighting network is taught. (See Col. 6. Lines 46-50). Also, please refer to the rejection of Claim 1. Generating top light codes to illuminate LED's per jurisdiction is an intended usage of Applicant's invention. With a computer controlled system, one can illuminate LED's based on virtually any requirements desired. This includes conveying a "denomination" of the machine. Therefore, Lys teaches the claimed limitations.

Claim 16:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys teaches a light diffuser. See Col. 75 Lines 48-51.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys et al. (US 6,720,745), as applied to the claims above, in yet further view of Griswold et al. (US 6,027,115).

Claim 10:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys does not teach a slot machine with multiple reels in the housing. Griswold teaches a gaming machine with multiple reels. See Griswold Figure 1 & Figures 2A-2D.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to provide a slot machine with multiple reels for the purpose of providing optical displays on spinning reels in a slot machine. Further, this is considered a substitution of known elements (multiple reels in a slot machine are known elements) with the predictable results of providing entertaining displays to a player.

Claims 15 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys et al. (US 6,720,745), as applied to the claims above, in yet further view of Heidel et al. (US 6,014,594).

Claims 15 & 19:

Applicant admitted prior art in view of Lys does not teach indication of a game machine's maintenance needs to casino personnel.

Heidel teaches sending a signal to casino personnel should some maintenance need arise.

A unique light sequence indicating maintenance needs is a signal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to signal casino operators of a machine's maintenance need via a light sequence. If one machine on the casino floor was exhibiting a unique display on its top light region, this would draw the attention of casino personnel to that machine's maintenance need.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMKAR A. DEODHAR whose telephone number is (571)272-1647. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OAD

/Corbett Coburn/
Primary Examiner
AU 3714